United Nations A/60/73

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 April 2005

Original: English

Sixtieth session
Item 126 of the preliminary list*
Programme planning

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on proposals on the strengthening and monitoring of programme performance and evaluation

Executive summary

The present report was prepared in response to General Assembly resolution 58/269 of 23 December 2003, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to entrust the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), in collaboration with the Joint Inspection Unit, with submitting to the General Assembly for consideration at its sixtieth session proposals on the strengthening and monitoring of programme performance and evaluation. It contains the final report of the Secretariat-wide Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation (see paras. 7-22), established by OIOS to develop specific proposals and ensure broad support among departments and offices. It also contains the comments of the Joint Inspection Unit (paras. 23-28) on the report of the Working Group, which were integrated into the conclusion (paras. 29-35) and the annex to the present report.

The Working Group found that despite recent progress, the current monitoring and evaluation system in the United Nations requires improvements to have a noticeable impact on future plans and decisions. It concluded that in order to strengthen monitoring and evaluation, the roles of the three main stakeholder groups, namely, the intergovernmental bodies, OIOS, and the programme and senior managers of the Secretariat, needed to be clarified and their responsibilities enhanced.

The intergovernmental bodies should use monitoring and evaluation findings as a basis for making more action-oriented recommendations and decisions to enhance the relevance, usefulness and effectiveness of programmes and subprogrammes.

* A/60/50 and Corr.1.

05-32657 (E) 170505

Programme planning, including monitoring and evaluation reports, should be included as a standing item on the agendas of the General Assembly, the Main Committees of the General Assembly and intergovernmental and other special intergovernmental bodies. The General Assembly emphasized that requirement in its resolution 59/275 of 23 December 2004.

In order to strengthen the professional and methodological support provided to monitoring and evaluation in the Secretariat, the Working Group proposed that OIOS should strengthen its central monitoring and evaluation facility and enhance its reporting formats and procedures. The Working Group also emphasized the need to promote and increase the use of self-evaluation by programme managers and senior managers.

Finally, the need to integrate and improve the existing results-based management tools and techniques was emphasized by the Working Group. Therefore, a new version of the Integrated Monitoring and Documentation Information System (IMDIS) should be developed in consultation with programme managers to increase their use of IMDIS as a management and monitoring tool. In addition, continued funding of IMDIS for that purpose should be identified.

Concurring with the proposals of the Working Group, the Joint Inspection Unit stressed that the largest risk threatening the successful implementation of results-based management is the complexity of the performance measurement system and the burden placed on managers for data collection and on the governing bodies for the analysis of such data. Prior to the present report, the Joint Inspection Unit issued a comprehensive series of reports on results-based management entitled "Managing for results in the United Nations system". The findings and conclusions of the present report are in agreement with the previous reports of the Joint Inspection Unit (see para. 21 of the present report).

OIOS and the Joint Inspection Unit conclude that a successful results-based management system, based on strengthened monitoring and evaluation practices in the Secretariat, is a sine qua non for meeting the challenges and objectives of the Secretary-General's most recent reform proposals contained in his report entitled, "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all" (A/59/2005). Therefore, the three main stakeholder groups are urged to make a concerted effort to complete the implementation of the action items in the present report without delay.

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–6	4
II.	Final report of the Secretariat-wide Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation	7–22	5
	A. Enhancing intergovernmental review of monitoring and evaluation reports	7–10	5
	B. Strengthened central monitoring and evaluation facility and improved results-based management systems	11–18	6
	C. Promoting self-evaluation	19–22	7
III.	Comments of the Joint Inspection Unit	23–28	8
IV.	Conclusion	29–35	10
Annex			
	List of specific action items to strengthen monitoring and evaluation		12

I. Introduction

1. The present report was prepared in response to General Assembly resolution 58/269, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to entrust the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), in collaboration with the Joint Inspection Unit, with submitting to the General Assembly for consideration at its sixtieth session proposals on the strengthening and monitoring of programme performance and evaluation. The report will also serve as background information for the forty-fifth session of the Committee on Programme and Coordination.

2. Prior to the adoption of the resolution, the Steering Committee on Reform and Management[1] asked OIOS to take the lead in developing specific proposals for strengthening the Organization's system of monitoring and evaluation. OIOS therefore established a Working Group on Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation to review the issue, chaired by the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services, consisting of representatives from the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the Department of Management, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Office of Legal Affairs, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the Department of Public Information, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, and the Office of Internal Oversight Services.

3. The Working Group submitted a preliminary report to the Steering Committee in April 2004, which was endorsed by the Steering Committee. In May 2004, the Working Group established five Task Forces to review the following issues: (a) use of indicators; (b) enhancing the role of the Integrated Monitoring and Documentation Information System (IMDIS); (c) better use of monitoring and evaluation products; (d) self-evaluation; and (e) strengthening central monitoring and evaluation capacities. On 2 February 2005, the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services submitted the final report of the Working Group to the Steering Committee on Reform and Management for its consideration. In due time OIOS will provide information on any action taken by the new Senior Committee on Management on the report.

4. The present report addresses the distinct roles and responsibilities of the Organization's three major groups of stakeholders in the process of strengthening monitoring and evaluation, namely, the intergovernmental bodies, OIOS and the senior and programme managers of the Secretariat. The annex provides an overview of the action items necessary to enhance the system, several of which are ongoing. As initially suggested by the Steering Committee, the action is of a practical nature, taking into account the capacity that exists in the Secretariat.

5. The report of the Secretary-General on an agenda for further change, General Assembly resolution 57/282 of 20 December 2002 and resolution 58/269, as well as OIOS and Joint Inspection Unit reports on the issue[2] have previously pointed to the need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation in order to ensure the successful implementation of results-based management in the United Nations. For that to happen, a system of high-quality monitoring and evaluation which meets the needs

[1] The Steering Committee has been replaced by the new Senior Committee on Management, while the Management Performance Board replaces the Accountability Panel, according to the Secretary-General's announcement issued in April 2005.

[2] See A/57/387 and Corr.1, A/58/395 and Corr.1, A/57/474, A/59/79 and A/59/617.

of managers and stakeholders should be further developed and put to practical use. By strengthening those critical elements, the results-based planning cycle will be enhanced.

6. Despite recent progress, the Working Group emphasized that the current monitoring and evaluation system still requires enhancements to have a discernible impact on future plans and decisions. It therefore proposed that roles and responsibilities needed to be clearly assigned and that managers should be held fully accountable for conducting and using monitoring and evaluation. Earmarking of resources for those functions in the respective programmes is a welcome step forward.

II. Final report of the Secretariat-wide Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation

A. Enhancing intergovernmental review of monitoring and evaluation reports

7. The intergovernmental bodies and the Organization's senior management need to be made more aware of progress, failures and major challenges faced in the implementation of mandates and to put that information to practical use for decision-making and planning for the Organization. The Working Group stressed that the Steering Committee on Reform and Management (or its replacement) has an important role to play in enhancing accountability for the implementation of its proposals in that regard.

8. The Working Group concluded that there are current gaps in the organizational learning process and shortcomings in the availability and quality of evaluation and self-evaluation findings. It therefore made specific proposals to strengthen the role and responsibility of the intergovernmental bodies for reviewing and applying the findings of the programme performance report of the Secretary-General and evaluation reports for planning and policymaking. That also includes adding monitoring and evaluation to the item on programme planning on the standing agendas of the Main Committees of the General Assembly and special intergovernmental bodies (see annex, action items 1-2), as subsequently mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 59/275 on programme planning, in which the Assembly emphasized the role of the Assembly in plenary meeting and of the Main Committees in reviewing and taking action on the appropriate recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Coordination relevant to their work, in accordance with regulation 4.10 of the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning and requested the General Committee to take fully into account resolutions 58/269 and 57/282 in the allocation of agenda items of the Main Committees.

9. Although at its forty-fourth session, in June 2004, the Committee for Programme and Coordination began consideration of ways to improve its working methods, not much concrete progress was made to enhance its actual use of monitoring and evaluation findings. However, as recommended by the Committee, the General Assembly at its fifty-ninth session requested the Secretariat to formally conduct preliminary performance assessments in the last quarter of a biennium and use them as reference for formulating the proposed Strategic Framework. It also

requested that in order to facilitate its consideration of the Organization's performance, the programme performance report should include descriptions of challenges, obstacles and unmet goals and that in-depth and thematic evaluations and triennial reviews should include a brief section on practical policy questions for which intergovernmental guidance and follow-up would be useful (see annex, action item 9).

10. Steps have been taken to implement the General Assembly's requests. For example, OIOS issued an Advisory Note[3] in which programme managers were requested to conduct assessments in the last quarter of a biennium for use as reference in formulating the proposed Strategic Framework.

B. Strengthened central monitoring and evaluation facility and improved results-based management systems

11. A robust central facility is vital to any effort to strengthen monitoring and evaluation in the United Nations. That central function in OIOS must be both fully engaged and resourced in order to meet its primary responsibilities of supporting and undertaking monitoring and evaluation activities and providing an assessment on topics of greatest strategic importance to the Organization. To date, the activities of OIOS have concentrated on the preparation of mandated reports, the conduct of programme monitoring and limited support to results-based management.

12. A more vigorous central monitoring and evaluation capacity will result in enhanced support to senior decision makers and programme managers in making the Organization more effective, by providing timely, valid and reliable information that can be used to improve the concept, design, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of United Nations programmes. A strong central function also assures common methodological standards, evaluative tools and professional guidance (see annex, action items 5-8).

13. To strengthen the objectivity and credibility of the evaluative evidence provided to senior decision makers and programme managers, it is important to differentiate more clearly the monitoring and the evaluation functions, and with regard to evaluation, to emphasize the importance for both a strong self-evaluation function and a strong independent, external evaluation function. While the two have some common issues, such as methodology, they are distinct but equally important functions. Independent, external evaluations conducted by OIOS are a primary source that the intergovernmental bodies can turn to for an objective, impartial perspective on the achievements of United Nations programmes and activities. Existing resources are just sufficient to complete the mandated evaluations and triennial reviews, with little room for qualitative or quantitative enhancements of the function.

14. Nevertheless, with available resources, some progress has been made in enhancing Organization-wide support provided by the central monitoring and evaluation facility. A glossary of common monitoring and evaluation terms and a

[3] Programme performance reporting for 2004-2005; Advisory Note No. 3: Preliminary programme performance assessment, 25 August 2004.

tutorial on programme performance assessments have been released.[4] An evaluation manual will be released in mid-2005 (see annex, action item 4).

15. The Working Group concluded that while the Secretariat has made significant efforts to introduce results-based management principles and related systems, the change towards results-oriented planning, budgeting and performance assessment is not yet complete. There is a need to integrate the Organization's programme and financial performance reports and to provide linkages between the different databases, e.g., IMIS, BIS, E-drits; E-meets, to avoid redundant data entry and to facilitate automatic flow of programming and financial information, including cost-accounting.[5]

16. It was agreed that a significant step towards strengthening monitoring and evaluation is the enhancement and improved utility of IMDIS, which is being used as a planning, monitoring and reporting tool for results-based management. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs currently administers IMDIS in collaboration with OIOS and the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts. Although IMDIS and related procedures have been upgraded progressively, some users still view the practical methods of monitoring as cumbersome and in need of improvement. The Working Group emphasized that the specific needs of programme managers should be taken into consideration to strengthen the use of IMDIS for results-based management and that the development of IMDIS should be adequately resourced.

17. With regard to the improvement of IMDIS, the Working Group recommended integrating the existing tools for results-based management and that the improvement be undertaken in phases (see annex, action item 10). The aim is to bring together the financial and programme performance aspects of planning, monitoring and evaluation and to incorporate the day-to-day needs of programme managers in the larger results-based management framework.

18. The Working Group also concluded that OIOS and the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts should continue to provide guidance on a regular basis to ensure consistency and uniformity in the results terminology used throughout the Secretariat.[6] It found that the logical frameworks were formulated inconsistently, at various levels and within different time frames.

C. Promoting self-evaluation

19. Self-evaluation has been an integral element of the monitoring and evaluation requirements since 1986. However, there is no uniform standard for self-evaluation: while some managers view it as a structured, formal "event", others see it as an informal, ongoing managerial process. There is agreement, however, that the major

[4] See: http://www.un.org/Depts/oios/mecd/mecd_glossary/index.htm. and http://www.un.org/Depts/oios/mecd/un_pparbm/index.htm. UNDP and UNFPA have their own glossaries.

[5] The General Assembly adopted the recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Coordination that it request the Secretary-General to develop tools for identifying the cost of activities and outputs and to report to it at its sixtieth session on options for applying cost-accounting techniques drawing on best international practices (see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/59/16, para. 349)).

[6] An important step in that direction was the recent issuance of the glossary of common monitoring and evaluation terms.

obstacles to self-evaluation are: an uneven commitment from programme managers; shortage of time and resources; and a lack of guidance, training and consistent monitoring of self-evaluation.

20. The Working Group agreed that promoting more extensive and uniform use of self-evaluation requires both "top-down" and "bottom-up" measures. It was also agreed that the principles underlying those measures should involve the following:

(a) Senior management needs to unequivocally emphasize self-evaluation as a priority;

(b) Managers should be encouraged to view self-evaluation as an integral part of planning and assessing their work and not as an optional extra;

(c) Self-evaluation should be seen as providing an opportunity for lesson learning and corrective action initiated by programme managers. Senior managers should ensure that self-assessment is used to promote effective programme management (see annex, action items 12-14).

21. One important step in promoting self-evaluation has been the incorporation of a specific section on evaluation planning at the subprogramme level, in the programme budget instructions issued in September 2004. An Advisory Note[7] was also issued by OIOS containing detailed information on how to prepare those plans for submission with the draft budgets in mid-December 2004. In order to update the practice of self-evaluation within the context of results-based management, a distinction was highlighted between (a) mandatory self-assessment, which covers self-evaluation in the context of the programme performance report, and (b) discretionary self-evaluation, which allows programme managers to choose topics for internal assessment which will meet their internal evaluation needs. More than 100 evaluation plans were submitted to the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts by April 2005, covering approximately half of the subprogrammes in the Strategic Framework for 2006-2007 and containing some 200 topics for self-evaluation.

22. The Working Group agreed that training should be offered to top management, senior managers and staff-at-large to enhance their understanding of the value and techniques of self-evaluation (see annex, action item 15).

III. Comments of the Joint Inspection Unit

23. It should be noted that since the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 58/269, the Joint Inspection Unit has issued a comprehensive series of reports on results-based management, entitled "Managing for results in the United Nations system".[8] The Unit wishes to draw the attention of the General Assembly in particular to paragraphs 49 to 73 of part I in the series, entitled "Implementation of results-based management in the United Nations organizations".[9] The Unit in those paragraphs of its report outlined the steps necessary to the strengthening of performance monitoring and the effective use of evaluation findings and described a

[7] Evaluation Plans for 2006-2007, Advisory Note No. 5, Preparing an evaluation plan as part of submitting the programme budget for 2006-2007.

[8] See A/59/607, A/59/617, A/59/631 and A/59/632.

[9] See A/59/607.

number of practices in place in organizations of the United Nations system as well as challenges faced by those organizations.

24. It is particularly gratifying to note the convergence between those recommendations and the proposals outlined by the Working Group in paragraphs 7-20 of the present report. The Unit, therefore, concurs with the proposals. Accordingly, it welcomes steps already taken by OIOS to reinforce its role in providing central support and guidance to managers throughout the Secretariat with the issuance of the glossary of common monitoring and evaluation terms and the preparation of the evaluation manual. It is especially encouraged by the decision to review and improve IMDIS, as it had expressed concern that the system, in its present configuration, is not user-friendly and does not meet the specific performance monitoring requirements in different departments.[10] Similarly, the creation of an evaluation database, now scheduled by OIOS for 2005, was cited as good practice in the Unit's report.[11]

25. Because the effectiveness of any given performance-monitoring system is a function of the quality of the defined results and indicators designed to measure the progress towards achievement of those results, assistance to managers should also focus upstream on improving the definition of results and indicators. The biggest risk factor threatening the successful implementation of results-based management has been identified as the over-complexity of the performance measurement and the excessive burden placed on managers for data collection, as well as on governing bodies for the analysis of such data. The Joint Inspection Unit therefore proposes that in addition to the steps outlined by the Working Group, further guidance be provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division of the Department of Management and OIOS to all managers in the design of simple results and few but meaningful indicators. Reflection should also be pursued as to the possibility of identifying centrally standard indicators to measure performance at the organizational level. Further, as previously suggested, the High-Level Committee on Management of the Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) could explore the possibility of identifying key performance indicators at the level of the United Nations system.

26. In addition, the authors of the Joint Inspection Unit report on managing for results stressed that: "self-evaluation should constitute the backbone of any effective evaluation system".[12] The Unit notes with satisfaction the strong emphasis placed by the Working Group on self-evaluation, but reiterates its caution that introducing self-evaluation has proved to be a major challenge for most organizations of the United Nations system. Therefore, providing adequate training and ensuring the accountability of senior managers through the incorporation of self-evaluation in their Compacts with the Secretary-General will indeed be essential.

27. Finally, the Unit concurs with the views of the Working Group on the importance of intergovernmental review of monitoring and evaluation products, as it has itself stressed that improving the performance of the Organization can be achieved only through the effective use of performance information and evaluation findings by all relevant bodies in the programme planning and decision-making process. A number of obstacles, however, have long placed limits on their ability to

[10] Ibid., paras. 58 and 59.
[11] Ibid., paras. 72 and 73.
[12] Ibid., para. 68.

do so. A previous Joint Inspection Unit report showed that the lack of interim reporting on programme performance during a given biennium hindered the timely adjustment of future programme orientation and that existing mechanisms were not conducive to a timely and systematic feedback of evaluation results into the next biennial budget.[13]

28. The endorsement by the General Assembly at its fifty-ninth session of the OIOS proposal that the Secretariat formally conduct preliminary performance assessments in the last quarter of a biennium to be used as reference for formulating the Strategic Framework goes some way towards correcting that shortcoming.[14] It is equally important that performance and evaluation information provided to the intergovernmental bodies include an assessment of the adequacy of resources allocated to the achievement of expected results so as to allow for better alignment between resources and results, a linkage which has been shown to be critical to the full implementation of results-based management.

IV. Conclusion

29. OIOS and the Joint Inspection Unit conclude that the successful implementation of a results-based management system, based on effective monitoring and evaluation practices and intergovernmental review, is essential if the Organization is to meet the challenges and objectives of the Secretary-General's most recent reform proposals (see A/59/2005). The three main stakeholder groups, namely the intergovernmental bodies, OIOS and senior and programme managers, should therefore make a concerted effort to implement without delay the action items contained in the annex to the present report.

30. Since December 2003, progress has been made in strengthening the monitoring of programme performance and evaluation. For example, OIOS and the Joint Inspection Unit welcome the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 59/275 on programme planning, in which the Assembly emphasized the role of the Assembly and its Main Committees in reviewing and taking action on the appropriate recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Coordination relevant to their work (see annex, action items 1-2).

31. OIOS and the Joint Inspection Unit are also encouraged by the steps being taken to institute interim performance reporting at the last quarter of the biennium, which will enable the intergovernmental bodies to apply the findings of the programme performance report and evaluation reports to the planning of new biennial budgets. The Joint Inspection Unit proposed that that preliminary step should include an assessment of the adequacy of resources allocated to the achievement of results to allow for better alignment between resources and results, a linkage which has been shown to be critical to the full implementation of results-based management. The proposal has been incorporated in the annex to the present report (see action item 3 (a)).

32. In its risk assessment, the Joint Inspection Unit found that the most significant risk to the successful implementation of results-based management was the current complexity of systems and burden on management to collect data and on

[13] A/58/375, para. 22.

[14] A/59/79, para. 34.

intergovernmental bodies to analyse such data. The Unit therefore proposed that the central support functions, namely, OIOS and the Programme Planning and Budget Division, should focus their guidance to programme managers on ensuring simple results and a few but meaningful standard indicators. The Joint Inspection Unit also proposed that the High-level Committee of Management of CEB, should explore the possibility of articulating key performance indicators at the United Nations system level. Those proposals have been incorporated in the annex (see action item 11 (a)).

33. OIOS is currently considering how to strengthen its in-depth and thematic evaluation function and its response to ad hoc evaluation requests to ensure that intergovernmental bodies are provided with high-quality professional and objective reports on the performance of programmes and activities. Additional resources would be needed to contract independent, highly regarded experts to provide technical assistance and input to both in-depth and thematic evaluations. Additional resources would also be required from Programmes requesting ad hoc evaluations in order to enable OIOS to respond adequately.

34. With regard to the introduction and use of self-evaluation, the Joint Inspection Unit cautioned that that has proved to be a key challenge for most organizations of the United Nations system. OIOS and the Unit agree that a concerted effort is needed to ensure common professional standards and methodologies and to promote the use of self-evaluations more effectively. OIOS will seek to achieve that objective within existing resources, in collaboration with the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts, pending the approval of the 2006-2007 proposed programme budget. Furthermore, adequate training must be made available and managers held accountable for conducting self-evaluation to allow a more effective management culture to take hold in the Organization. The Management Performance Board will have an important role in ensuring that those objectives are met (see annex, action items 3 and 12-15).

35. Both OIOS and the Joint Inspection Unit conclude that the tools and systems supporting results-based management in the Organization must be improved and integrated. Therefore, a new version of IMDIS must be developed to meet the specific performance-measurement requirements in the various departments and offices and to encourage its use as a management and monitoring tool.

Annex

List of specific action items to strengthen monitoring and evaluation

The table below contains a list of specific action items aimed at clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the Organization's stakeholders in the process of strengthening monitoring and evaluation. The action points are expected to be endorsed by the Senior Committee on Management and are in various stages of implementation.

Action item	*Focal point*	*Roles and responsibilities*	*Timing and resources*
		A. Enhancing intergovernmental review of monitoring and evaluation products	
1. Enhance review of performance and evaluation reports to focus on policy decisions	Committee for Programme and Coordination	Focus on specific questions or headings addressing the relevance, usefulness, efficiency and effectiveness of the work carried out under a given programme. Provide action-oriented recommendations to enhance relevance, usefulness and effectiveness of United Nations programmes and subprogrammes	Annual sessions (June 2005)
2. Include programme planning (monitoring and evaluation) as standing agenda item	Secretariat of the Fifth Committee and the Committee for Programme and Coordination, Department for General Assembly and Conference Management;[a] (Main Committees of the General Assembly and General Assembly in plenary meeting); and special intergovernmental bodies. Implementation to be coordinated by the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts and OIOS	• Include item on programme planning to enhance discussion of evaluation, planning, budgeting and monitoring reports, including the Programme Performance Report, as per new General Assembly mandate (resolution 59/275) • Include annotations provided by the Secretariat containing guidance on action to be taken • Examine progress	Annual sessions of the General Assembly (General Committee) as well as those required by other intergovernmental or special intergovernmental bodies

Action item	*Focal point*	*Roles and responsibilities*	*Timing and resources*
3. Enhance accountability for conduct of monitoring and evaluation, use for planning, and for allocation of resources for monitoring and evaluation	Management Performance Board	• Monitor the conduct and use of monitoring and evaluation for planning • Request periodic progress reports from senior managers on achieving expected results • Monitor allocation of resources for monitoring and evaluation for each programme	Ongoing Possible resource implications for departments
3 (a). Include interim preliminary assessment of adequacy of resources	Programme managers	The Joint Inspection Unit proposed that the preliminary performance review in the last quarter of a biennium should include an assessment of the adequacy of resources allocated to the achievement of results	
B. Strengthened central monitoring and evaluation facility and improved results-based management systems			
4. Develop and update standards and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation	OIOS	Develop and disseminate a monitoring and evaluation glossary and an evaluation manual to establish common standards and assist programme managers in planning, designing and conducting self-evaluations	Glossary completed in December 2004; manual anticipated by mid-2005
5. Promote monitoring and evaluation best practices	OIOS	Establish a central system and mechanism for collecting, analysing and disseminating innovative and effective monitoring and evaluation methods and results	2005, pending approval of $190,000 proposed in additional resources; total of $60,000 before recosting has been assessed (A/60/6 (Sect. 29))

Action item	*Focal point*	*Roles and responsibilities*	*Timing and resources*
6. Provide methodological support to monitoring and evaluation activities in the Secretariat	OIOS	Institute a help desk function to serve as a catalyst and facilitator of discussion on methodological issues and to draw attention to the latest information in the fields of performance assessment and evaluation	2005-2006 Redeployment of resources from within OIOS
7. Establish and keep up to date a database on all Secretariat and other related United Nations system reports	OIOS	Develop and maintain a central database for all Secretariat monitoring and evaluation reports that would be searchable by criteria, such as topic, country and programme	Redeployment of resources from within OIOS
8. Diversify the central monitoring and evaluation capacity to enable it to respond to ad hoc requests	OIOS	Develop a rapid-response function to conduct ad hoc evaluations that will meet the needs of senior decision makers and programme managers for timely information	2006 Redeployment of resources from within OIOS; resources from requesting programmes
9. Improve and strengthen monitoring and evaluation reporting formats and procedures	OIOS	Enhance the report formats of evaluations to allow for more effective presentation of findings and recommendations and to focus on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact	2005 in-depth and thematic evaluation reports
		Enhance Programme Performance Report to include findings on challenges, obstacles and unmet goals; strengthen information on targets and lessons learned	2004-2005 Programme Performance Report

Action item	*Focal point*	*Roles and responsibilities*	*Timing and resources*
10. Develop common results-based management tools and determine continued funding	**Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts/OIOS**	Improving and integrating results-based management tools: • Incremental improvements to results-based management tools and techniques, including a new version of IMDIS to increase its use as a management/ monitoring tool	Resources needed: To be determined
		Phase 1: Needs assessment and prototyping	(By December 2006)
		Phase 2: Systems development and upgrading	To be determined
11. Consistency in use of objectives, expected accomplishments and indicators	**Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts/OIOS**	Provide consistency in the results terminology that harmonizes the levels and time frames of objectives, expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement, taking into consideration requests of Member States	2005 (ongoing)
11 (a). Focus on simple results and few, meaningful indicators; United Nations system level indicators	**Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts/OIOS** **CEB**	Focus guidance on simple results and a few but meaningful standard indicators. High-level Committee of Management, CEB, should explore the possibility of articulating key performance indicators at the United Nations system level	
		C. Promoting self-evaluation	
12. Dedicate Senior Management Group session to reinforce self-evaluation effort	**Senior Management Group/OIOS**	Demonstrate that priority is being accorded self-evaluation by senior management	2005 (second quarter)

Action item	*Focal point*	*Roles and responsibilities*	*Timing and resources*
13. Incorporate self-evaluation as priority area in Secretary-General's Compacts with senior managers	Department of Management/Office of Human Resources Management	Same as above	2006
14. Periodic briefings to the Senior Committee on Management on self-evaluation results	Senior Committee on Management	Require succinct presentations by Under-Secretary-Generals highlighting results, constraints, lessons learned and best practices of interest to other programmes	On a rolling basis throughout the current biennium
15. Implement training strategy	Office of Human Resources Management/ OIOS	Incorporate self-evaluation modules in: • Induction training for heads of departments • Training for senior managers • Departmental retreats • Periodic training workshops on self-evaluation methods	2005